

Marin County Workshop
May 19, 2008, 6pm-8pm
Community Center Auditorium
San Rafael CA

Some 55 people were in attendance. MTC Director of Legislation and Public Affairs Randy Rentschler offered introductory remarks. Participants watched a 12-minute video, and then had the opportunity to answer a series of questions via electronic voting. A discussion followed each question, where participants were able to bring up other issues, questions and concerns.

The Three E's

How would you rank these three goals?

| | Responses | |
|---------------|------------|-------------|
| | Count | Percentage |
| Economy | 39 | 32.77% |
| Environment | 41 | 34.45% |
| Equity | 39 | 32.77% |
| Totals | 119 | 100% |

Maintenance

Which of these should be a higher investment priority for the region's transportation system?

| | Responses | |
|--|-----------|-------------|
| | Count | Percentage |
| Option A: making investments to maintain the existing system of roads, and the existing bus, rail and ferry services in the region | 21 | 48.84% |
| Option B: making investments to build new roads and add more bus, rail and ferry services in the region | 22 | 51.16% |
| Totals | 43 | 100% |

Comments:

- Going to experience growth so need to invest in infrastructure
- We need more rail service
- Don't need new roads but need new bus, rail and toher services
- SMART rail is needed. But need options for people in other areas of Marin- need on call services for the elderly and disabled to get you to transit. Need a variety of ways.
- Want more ferries.
- Need option C for transportation system that reduces use of fuels- streetcars.
- Both important but tired of pollution- especially San Anselmo
- Way we are currently investing not working. Too many environmental and social impacts and sprawl. Option B can help us reorient development in a TOD fashion and protect natural resources and parks/open space.
- If we don't invest in existing you can't get to what we have
- If we don't maintain the system we have we'll be in a real whole.
- If we don't take care of existing buses than we'll just need more- must take care of what we have before we add new.
- Both options are horrible- keep system we don't like or add more that we don't like.

- Shouldn't expand if you can't support what you have.
- If we just maintain what we have will get more of the same. Need to build viable alternatives.
- If you don't repair roads in timely fashion cost to reconstruct is extremely high. When we rehab roads, add in bikeways.

| How much of our \$30M should be spent on maintenance? | Responses | |
|---|-----------|-------------|
| | Count | Percentage |
| Up to 25% (\$7.5 billion) | 11 | 26.19% |
| Up to 50% (\$15 billion) | 17 | 40.48% |
| Up to 75% (\$22.5 billion) | 13 | 30.95% |
| 100% (\$30 billion) | 1 | 2.38% |
| Totals | 42 | 100% |

Congestion Relief

| Which of these should be a higher investment priority for the region's transportation system? | Responses | |
|--|-----------|-------------|
| | Count | Percentage |
| Option A: Investing in <u>highway</u> system to relieve traffic congestion. (For example, ramp metering, high-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes.) | 7 | 15.91% |
| Option B: Investing in <u>public transit</u> options including rail and buses to provide alternatives to driving. | 29 | 65.91% |
| Option C: Investing in <u>walking paths and bicycle lanes</u> to provide alternatives to driving. | 8 | 18.18% |
| Totals | 44 | 100% |

- Must also consider disabled- they don't have alternatives.
- Keeps cars off the road.
- With gas so expensive and upswing in public transit use, we need to provide lots of public transit. While bikes are important, not everyone can use them- distances, physical ability, etc.
- A) promotes auto use. If invest in public transit also support bike/ped.
- Idea is to get cars off the road.
- How about carpools and informal carpools. Use the empty seats in the car.
- With developing oil crisis, people's attitudes will change and we need to think of drastic solutions.
- In Europe, gas prices have been high for a long time. But efficiency of cars was much better. Better driver behavior. Smaller cars/more efficient. The key is getting the big cars off the road.
- Carpools great way to get to transit.
- We have the most incomplete bike/walk network of all our networks. We could have more people ride transit if they could walk/bike there.
- Safe routes to school.
- Optimize transportation system. SMART.
- Parents want a safe route to school so kids can bike.
- Paths and trails have deteriorated and people won't fix them and assume liability.

What do you think is the best way to share the road with trucks?

| | Responses | |
|--|-----------|-------------|
| | Count | Percentage |
| Keep trucks out of the peak commuter hours | 13 | 35.14% |
| Allow smaller trucks to use carpool lanes during congested periods for a fee | 4 | 10.81% |
| Encourage more cargo deliveries be made by rail or ferries | 16 | 43.24% |
| Build exclusive truck lanes supported by trucking fees | 2 | 5.41% |
| Provide more truck parking in commercial business areas | 2 | 5.41% |
| Totals | 37 | 100% |

Focused Growth

Which of these should be a higher investment priority?

| | Responses | |
|---|-----------|-------------|
| | Count | Percentage |
| <u>Option A:</u> Providing more transportation funds to communities that are planning to build more housing along BART and other public transit lines | 34 | 77.27% |
| <u>Option B:</u> Providing transportation funds evenly to communities regardless of where they are planning to build homes | 10 | 22.73% |
| Totals | 44 | 100% |

- More compact development but need amenities- stores, open space.
- Neither- we're built out in the center of the community. Need feeder systems to get them to transportation.
- In Marin we're a little different than other counties. Land use patterns- we're happy the way we are. We don't want to become more built up.
- TOD takes people out of cars. That needs to be one of our objectives.
- TOD allows people to get where they need to go w/out getting in cars. Need to get rid of single occupant drivers. Should think about all redevelopment taking place with TOD in mind.
- Need affordable housing near transit.
- Marin has lots of opportunities for growth in one area- need to revitalize our downtowns to revitalize local economy, more pedestrian environment can help. Bring the revenues our towns need for city services, but must get people to downtowns without driving.
- Transit as multi-layered system—regional, local, very local. Need to have mixed use development as much as possible.
- Idea of providing evenly distributed funds will incentivize people to develop smaller alternatives- smaller solutions rather than only focusing on large things like BART.
- Need a variety of transit options- commuter rail, transit, smaller services.
- SMART should go from Sonoma to Solano to tie in to BART. Allows them to get to public transit system without overwhelming ferry system.

Access

Transit Subsidy Based on Income: Transit fare discounts are currently given to youth, seniors, and the disabled. In addition to these subsidies, do you think there should be a subsidy for low-income transit riders?

| There should be a subsidy for low-income riders. | Responses | |
|--|-----------|-------------|
| | Count | Percentage |
| Strongly Agree | 21 | 43.75% |
| Agree | 15 | 31.25% |
| Neutral | 9 | 18.75% |
| Disagree | 2 | 4.17% |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 2.08% |
| Totals | 48 | 100% |

- Utility and transportation costs are a high percentage of those family's disposable incomes.
- You want those people to be able to access jobs. Help remove the barrier of getting to work.
- Equity and justice.
- Tendency is for low income to have older more polluting cars- should give them options.
- Many low income become home bound because can't afford to leave for recreation/entertainment.
- Low income people spend as much as 40% of income on transportation. Huge inequity.
- Too confusing to try to figure out who would qualify as low income.
- Public transportation should be free. Portland example given.

| I favor basing all transit fare subsidies on income rather than age or disability. | Responses | |
|--|-----------|-------------|
| | Count | Percentage |
| Strongly Agree | 3 | 6.98% |
| Agree | 9 | 20.93% |
| Neutral | 6 | 13.95% |
| Disagree | 14 | 32.56% |
| Strongly Disagree | 11 | 25.58% |
| Totals | 43 | 100% |

- Discounts should be for who you actually are- income is too hard to check.
- Book keeping nightmare to determine who would qualify.
- No confidence of confidentiality of personal information.
- Build infrastructure to get people out of cars. Make public transportation available, accessible and convenient for everyone.
- Transit should be free or a very small amount.
- Going to be difficult but someone might consider giving certain types of employees- educators, students, police, fire—people who provide a public service.
- Have off-peak reduced rates.

Emissions Reduction

Which of these should be a higher investment priority?

| | Responses | |
|--|-----------|-------------|
| | Count | Percentage |
| Option A: Focusing on reducing tailpipe emissions and encouraging alternatives to driving. | 43 | 91.49% |
| Option B: Improving our ability to drive more easily around the Bay Area. | 4 | 8.51% |
| Totals | 47 | 100% |

- Car is the form of the past. Marin is very geographically constrained. You can't keep banking on cars.
- Should have been an option c for research and development for alternative fuels.
- We need to be looking at finding ways to fund research because old system is not going to work. Need a different type of vehicle.
- Important to encourage alternatives to driving and get close to peoples homes so they can use public transit. Get transit services extended to where people live.
- Need high-speed trains.
- People who work in Marin can't afford to live here.
- Government doesn't need to put more of our money into R&D- the car companies kno they must do it or they are going out of business.
- Can have option a and b- make transit free or \$1 and people will be very creative in how they take transit.
- Oil companies are making 50x's what they are- they need to put money into the systems here, like they do in Europe.
- Must change our behavior and habits. Put our financial investments in the same place we need to put our collective will and action.

Which programs do you think are most effective to reduce the amount of CO2 emissions?

| | Responses | |
|---|-----------|-------------|
| | Count | Percentage |
| Subsidize purchase of newer/cleaner vehicles | 4 | 7.55% |
| Provide more/cheaper public transit | 6 | 11.32% |
| Develop regional awareness campaign to encourage people to reduce fossil fuel use | 5 | 9.43% |
| Build more bike paths and sidewalks | 15 | 28.30% |
| Funding incentives to cities to allow more development near transit | 14 | 26.42% |
| Support local traffic signal timing coordination | 9 | 16.98% |
| Totals | 53 | 100% |

Investment Tradeoffs

| You have \$10 – Click each number once for each dollar you want to spend. | Responses | |
|---|------------|-------------|
| | Count | Percentage |
| Maintenance | 96 | 19.75% |
| Congestion Relief | 84 | 17.28% |
| Focus Growth | 96 | 19.75% |
| Access | 80 | 16.46% |
| Emissions Reduction | 130 | 26.75% |
| Totals | 486 | 100% |

New Revenues

| Which of the following new revenue sources would you support? (Multiple answers OK) | Responses | |
|---|------------|-------------|
| | Count | Percentage |
| Regional gas fee | 34 | 25% |
| Higher bridge toll | 11 | 8.09% |
| Road tolls | 15 | 11.03% |
| Vehicle registration fees | 39 | 28.68% |
| County transportation sales taxes | 19 | 13.97% |
| Other new revenues | 15 | 11.03% |
| No new fees or increases | 3 | 2.21% |
| Totals | 136 | 100% |

Mr. Eric Schotenmeyer — Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) presentation

- Process is difficult- many choices need to be made.
- Transportation 2030 Plan: there are projects in that plan that are now coming to fruition — HOV gap closure on 101, tunnel for bike/ped use, Greenbrae Corridor, etc.
- This process does lead to something.
- TAM projects consistent with Measure A and county plan — backlog of maintenance, congestion relief, focused growth, access (Community-Based Transportation Plan), emissions reduction- promote alternative modes.

OPEN COMMENTS

| County | Category | Comment |
|--------|--|---|
| Marin | Reduce driving: Bike and walk projects | Peak oil: big problem with how our plan is focused. In 10 years we'll be in a major crisis and many people won't be able to afford to drive. Need to realize we won't have the capital for big transit projects- need to bike and walk. |
| Marin | Poor planning process | Larkspur and Marin County- disorder in the planning process. Various modes are concentrated at an inadequately coordinated transit hub. All the money seems to go to Corte Madera but all the problems seem to go to |

| | | |
|-------|--|--|
| | | Larkspur. |
| Marin | Rail | Years ago there was a good train system here in Marin County. Now there is no system and the money is wasted. |
| Marin | Reduce driving: Bike and ped projects; Flexible plan | Hope this will be a flexible plan because oil prices will change everything. Need to maintain our infrastructure, and develop bike and ped plans. Dedicated bus lanes, dedicated bike pathways, car free zones, grade separations, free bike stations, relocation of commercial and employment, shopping and living to be more consolidated. |
| Marin | Traffic calming | Traffic calming and free transit (Austin referenced). Traffic circles/roundabouts make it safer for bicyclist and pedestrians and also beautiful. |
| Marin | Committed funds | MTC should look at the committed funds. |
| Marin | Climate Protection | Climate change- need to invest in those strategies- walking, biking, public transit. Public health- obesity is a costly issue. Need to deal with public health, transit and climate all together. Supports safe routes to school and transit, regional bike and ped network and SMART. |
| Marin | Reduce driving: Trolley | To get people out of cars we need to provide a viable alternative. Rail is the answer. MTC's criteria are not correct- we should look at the best solution- rather than what costs the most. Marin Corridors plan- trolley down every major road in Marin. |
| Marin | Transit | Travel training program – transit can be fun. Help people learn how to use transit. |
| Marin | Reduce driving | Priority to reduce single driving because of energy crisis. Maintenance shortfall should be funded. Tax based on size and efficiency of vehicle. Big vehicle cause more damage to environment and roadways. |
| Marin | Climate Protection | Peak oil: are we considering sea level rise? |
| Marin | Climate Protection | Coming energy crisis. Need to direct planning funds to look at peak oil and consider re-evaluating committed funds in light of coming energy crisis. |
| Marin | Climate Protection | Climate change- 101 will be heavily impacts. Should evaluate what can actually be driven on in the next 10 years. Must make sure new development is not in flood plains. |
| Marin | Traffic calming | Traffic calming is essential- public health and safety are intertwined. Safe routes to school and transit are key. Judgments by planning agencies should be flexible- there are many opportunities for new things. |
| Marin | Misc. | We are paying the money for transportation in the form of gas prices but we don't keep much of it ourselves. |
| Marin | Planning process | Objection over Anderson Valley crossing- transportation planning processes are not helpful. Don't tear up rail tracks. |
| Marin | Misc. | 2035 plan needs to be re-evaluated. By 2020 there will be major changes that we aren't addressing. Funds should go to evaluate changes caused by increased costs of petroleum. |
| Marin | Rail | Peak oil- if Larkspur is unwilling to have SMART train, why can't SMART end in Hamilton? |
| Marin | Disability access | Accessibility for people with disabilities- people with poor vision or blindness- people need access to signage. Both for identifying the system and also to get through the transit systems. |
| Marin | Signage | Improve signage network. |

Written Comments Submitted at Workshop:

| County | Category | Comment |
|---------------|----------------------------|---|
| Marin | Smart Growth | Create car free zones Focus growth important to investment Have 511.org have a section like map quest where you can plug in your address and destination and show public transportation options including the closest bus stop/location of all stops |
| Marin | Access | Low cost or free access to public transit during winter months |
| Marin | Transit | Need SMART and trolleys on peripherals |
| Marin | Meeting | Have women wear no noise shoes! Very distracting. Go SMART |
| Marin | Meeting | The voting process is limited and some questions offer no good answer. It is not useful to us or to you to ask attendees to guess on questions of fact A segment of the meeting should be devoted to local projects |
| Marin | Smart Growth | Permits should not be allowed for drive in businesses which encourage car congestion in the CBD |
| Marin | Meeting | I like the format, voting, and discussion Great video using children! Good participation by attendees |
| Marin | Alternative Transportation | We need to look at incremental changes in addition to big projects such as facilitating carpooling even within the county. Have places people can park for several hours and go with someone else What about encouraging people to use “scooters,” electric bikes, “neighborhood” vehicles + have safe ways to do so. Will reduce emissions and be an intermediate step to get out of cars before walking and biking |
| Marin | Rail | Marin was first laid out on rail lines, it makes sense to reclaim those “roads” for trolleys and bike/ped lanes for public transportation. Trolleys are not only fun, they help build a sense of community and greatly reduce the class system that prevails in Marin. You only ride the bus if you can’t afford a car. Electric vehicles are an essential part of the alternative vehicles. The decline in available oil and natural gas must be in the forefront of all long term planning. |
| Marin | Meeting | This was a good location for the meeting ,but there were no bike racks and several people rode bicycles. It would be good for MTC to ensure that meeting sites are bicycle accessible and transit accessible. Several of the questions were confusing because highway and transit expansion were lumped together. Many SMART advocates voted for expansion only because they want the rail. Many of the questions made it sound like all of the \$30 M would go to one strategy or another when the distribution will end up being a mix. Should open up the discussion to include the \$192M in committed funds and align with all goals. Link Trans/Climate/Health |
| Marin | Funding Priorities | Marin County needs action and less measure A funds spent on consultants. 1% was to be max of measure A funds they spend over 20% on consultants for what? |
| Marin | Transit | “SMART” not smart at all. SMART is a tram to no where. Lillian Hanes for now 10 years has accomplished nothing except spend, spend, spend with no quality results for “green” solar transit train! SMART today is useless! |
| Marin | TOD | I don’t want to see MTC use the idea of transit-clustered development (and |

| | | |
|-------|---|--|
| | | <p>priorities given on \$ to communities that go in for them) to be used as a tool to blackmail the county into creating more and more density in the city of San Rafael.</p> <p>As someone noted Marin is different than the other 8 counties. As much as I support clean air, etc I don't think it should come at the expense of radically changing the city of San Rafael.</p> |
| Marin | Alternative transportation /Bikes | <p>Give me a place to park so I can take the GG transit or Bart first then give me these ideas. (I know Deb Hubsmith, she is good if not representative of the majority.)</p> <p>Also how in the world did bike riders get to be such a huge political lobby in Marin? I argue it is unfair. The majority of residents of Marin. They yield a disproportionate level of influence on politicians (local/county official) and I'd like to see politicians say NO to them and represent the majority of Marin residents.</p> <p>I'd like to see the hundreds of thousands of dollars spent studying how to give a handful of people a bike lane across the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge and use it to make 1) a place to park to take the GG Bus 2) a place to park to take BART instead of waiting for the 30-minute headway buses to/from Marin/East Bay (which it must be noted, GG doesn't much care if they're remotely on time) 30 Better road timing in other counties.</p> |
| Marin | Misc: Look for greatest results from investments | <p>Given security of funding resources, we need to focus on the most essential or "must have" programs and projects; those that deliver the greatest results for the dollars invested. This involves conducting due diligence. A case for doing so is SMART. Will the ridership justify the investment? Another case to examine is the expenditure of \$50 million to build bike lanes on the bridge—a desirable feature of the transportation system, but can we reduce congestion, maintain/grow infrastructure, move people and goods more effectively and clean our air to a greater degree by spending our money elsewhere?</p> |
| Marin | Misc. Urgent times | <p>I loved the meeting but given the prospect of peak oil we need a greater sense of urgency. We are in a sustainability emergency and we need to think in terms of a 10-15 year time frame, not 27 years. It seems like the public is ahead of the planners here on many issues and priorities.</p> |

Demographic Questions asked at Workshop:

| 1.) How did you get here this evening? | Responses | |
|---|------------------|-------------|
| Drove | 23 | 63.89% |
| Public Transportation | 3 | 8.33% |
| Carpool | 5 | 13.89% |
| Bike | 4 | 11.11% |
| Walked | 1 | 2.78% |
| Totals | 36 | 100% |

| 2.) How would you describe yourself? | Responses | |
|---|------------------|-------------|
| Business Advocate | 3 | 4.84% |
| Environmental Advocate | 13 | 20.97% |
| Community Advocate | 15 | 24.19% |
| Government/Agency Staff | 13 | 20.97% |
| Concerned Individual | 15 | 24.19% |
| Social Justice Advocate | 2 | 3.23% |
| Elected Official | 1 | 1.61% |
| Totals | 62 | 100% |

| 3.) How did you hear about tonight's meeting? | Responses | |
|--|------------------|-------------|
| Flyer | 9 | 20.45% |
| Website | 3 | 6.82% |
| Email | 23 | 52.27% |
| Other | 9 | 20.45% |
| Totals | 44 | 100% |

| 4.) Do you use public transportation regularly? (one to two times a week) | Responses | |
|--|------------------|-------------|
| Yes | 15 | 35.71% |
| No | 27 | 64.29% |
| Totals | 42 | 100% |

| 5.) Have you attended a public meeting or workshop on Bay Area transportation in the past? | Responses | |
|---|------------------|-------------|
| Yes | 34 | 79.07% |
| No | 9 | 20.93% |
| Totals | 43 | 100% |

| 6.) What County do you live in? | Responses | |
|--|------------------|-------------|
| Alameda | 1 | 2.27% |
| Contra Costa | 1 | 2.27% |
| Marin | 38 | 86.36% |
| Napa | 0 | 0% |
| San Francisco | 2 | 4.55% |
| San Mateo | 1 | 2.27% |
| Santa Clara | 0 | 0% |
| Solano | 0 | 0% |
| Sonoma | 1 | 2.27% |
| Totals | 44 | 100% |

| 7.) What is your gender? | Responses | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Male | 27 | 62.79% |
| Female | 16 | 37.21% |
| Totals | 43 | 100% |

| 8.) Are you Hispanic/Latino? | Responses | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Yes | 2 | 5% |
| No | 38 | 95% |
| Totals | 40 | 100% |

| 9.) How do you identify yourself (click all that apply) | Responses | |
|--|------------------|-------------|
| White | 38 | 90.48% |
| Chinese | 2 | 4.76% |
| Vietnamese | 0 | 0% |
| Asian/Indian | 0 | 0% |
| Black/African American | 0 | 0% |
| Japanese | 0 | 0% |
| Filipino | 0 | 0% |
| American Indian/Alaskan | 0 | 0% |
| Other Asian | 0 | 0% |
| Other Race | 2 | 4.76% |
| Totals | 42 | 100% |

| 10.) What is your age? | Responses | |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| 24 years and under | 0 | 0% |
| Between 25 and 59 | 22 | 52.38% |
| Over 60 | 20 | 47.62% |
| Totals | 42 | 100% |

Meeting Evaluation Questions Asked at Workshops:

| 34.) I had the opportunity to provide comments. | Responses | |
|--|------------------|-------------|
| Strongly Agree | 9 | 47.37% |
| Agree | 7 | 36.84% |
| Neutral | 0 | 0% |
| Disagree | 2 | 10.53% |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 5.26% |
| Totals | 19 | 100% |

| 35.) I found the meeting useful and informative. | Responses | |
|---|------------------|-------------|
| Strongly Agree | 6 | 27.27% |
| Agree | 10 | 45.45% |
| Neutral | 3 | 13.64% |
| Disagree | 2 | 9.09% |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 4.55% |
| Totals | 22 | 100% |

| 36.) I gained a better understanding of other people's perspectives. | Responses | |
|---|------------------|-------------|
| Strongly Agree | 2 | 10.53% |
| Agree | 9 | 47.37% |
| Neutral | 4 | 21.05% |
| Disagree | 2 | 10.53% |
| Strongly Disagree | 2 | 10.53% |
| Totals | 19 | 100% |

| 37.) The information presented was clear and had an appropriate level of detail. | Responses | |
|---|------------------|-------------|
| Strongly Agree | 3 | 13.04% |
| Agree | 6 | 26.09% |
| Neutral | 5 | 21.74% |
| Disagree | 7 | 30.43% |
| Strongly Disagree | 2 | 8.70% |
| Totals | 23 | 100% |

| 38.) A quality discussion of key issues took place. | Responses | |
|--|------------------|--|
|--|------------------|--|

| | | |
|-------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Strongly Agree | 1 | 4.76% |
| Agree | 10 | 47.62% |
| Neutral | 4 | 19.05% |
| Disagree | 5 | 23.81% |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 4.76% |
| Totals | 21 | 100% |

**39.) I learned more about transportation
planning in the Bay Area by participating tonight.**

Responses

| | | |
|-------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Strongly Agree | 2 | 10.53% |
| Agree | 9 | 47.37% |
| Neutral | 2 | 10.53% |
| Disagree | 4 | 21.05% |
| Strongly Disagree | 2 | 10.53% |
| Totals | 19 | 100% |

**40.) There were no barriers (language or other)
that prevented me from participating.**

Responses

| | | |
|-------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Strongly Agree | 13 | 59.09% |
| Agree | 6 | 27.27% |
| Neutral | 1 | 4.55% |
| Disagree | 1 | 4.55% |
| Strongly Disagree | 1 | 4.55% |
| Totals | 22 | 100% |